

Article

Watching the Watchers and McLuhan's Tetrad: The Limits of Cop-Watching in the Internet Age

Brian P. Schaefer

Kevin F. Steinmetz

University of Louisville, US.
brian.schaefer@louisville.edu

Kansas State University, US.
criminogenic@outlook.com

Abstract

The internet is considered by many to be a boon for political activists, such as cop-watchers—a free, open, and widespread medium in which to disseminate political messages. While there is truth to these claims, the internet, like any technology, can be used for many purposes and comes with its own arrangement of limitations. To elucidate these limitations and to provide a word of caution about the political potential of the internet, particularly for video-activists/cop-watchers, the theoretical work of Marshall McLuhan is used to understand how the internet, as a medium, shapes and limits political messages. Using McLuhan's tetrad, this study examines how the internet is problematic for cop-watching groups. In particular, the internet is said to yield consequences through how it (1) enhances or intensifies how the viewer experiences political messages through *speed*, (2) retrieves the importance of the narrator, (3) renders previous media increasingly obsolete, yet opens up new avenues for commercial dominance, and (4) creates additional *reversals* or other problems for video activism, such as the mass proliferation of surveillance and formatting discussion in counter-productive ways.

Introduction

*Take a look at the lawman, beating up the wrong guy, Oh man! Wonder if he'll ever know,
He's in the bestselling show.*

—David Bowie, *Life on Mars*

Accelerated technological growth and the proliferation of surveillance equipment has allowed for a significant increase in the breadth and power of surveillance assemblages. Despite authorities seeking to maintain control over surveillance, there is growing resistance which seeks to limit, destroy, or expose the ubiquity of such observation (Koskela 2011; Mann, Nolan, and Wellman 2003; Monahan 2006). Citizen surveillance of police or *cop-watching*, a process where citizens capture police activities ranging from the mundane (i.e., traffic stops) to the visceral (i.e., beating of handcuffed suspects), is a form of counter-surveillance viewed as democratic action capable of raising awareness and empowering individuals to combat police deviance and governance (Monahan 2010; Whitson 2010).

Research on the process of cop-watching primarily emphasizes the techniques used and purpose of reversing the surveillant gaze back towards the state, alluding to the need for democratic change in police practices (Koskela 2011; Mann, Nolan, and Wellman 2003; Monahan 2006, 2010; Whitson 2010). Attention has also been given to problems oriented around disseminating information gathered from cop-watching to a wider audience, a venture which often involves independently owned and operated media

Schaefer, B.P. and K.F. Steinmetz. 2014. Watching the Watchers and McLuhan's Tetrad: The Limits of Cop-Watching in the Internet Age. *Surveillance & Society* 12(4): 502-515.

<http://www.surveillance-and-society.org> | ISSN: 1477-7487

© The author(s), 2014 | Licensed to the Surveillance Studies Network under a [Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) license.

outlets (Indymedia) or—of particular importance for this analysis—the internet (Ullrich and Wollinger 2011; Wilson and Serisier 2010). New media technologies, such as the internet, provide new forms of social commons, increase journalistic independence, and provide an accessible platform in the fight against surveillance (Ullrich and Wollinger 2011; Wilson and Serisier 2010). In the research literature on the counter-surveillance of the police, rich theoretical descriptions are offered regarding the role of counter-surveillance as a form of democratic participation (Monahan 2010; Whitson 2010). Notably missing from the police counter-surveillance literature, however, is an examination of Web 2.0 as a medium and its potential to alter social interactions and discourse. The current analysis seeks to address this academic void.

To explore the problems presented by the internet medium towards the practice of cop-watching, Marshall McLuhan's (1964) notion that the *medium is the message* is employed. This perspective is useful for understanding how media—such as the internet—help alter, restrain, or obfuscate the meaning of communicated messages. McLuhan's theory was developed pre-Web 2.0, however, and thus offers only a starting point. More contemporary theoretical works are used to update McLuhan's framework. For instance, McLuhan and his son (1992) introduce a conceptual tetrad useful for sifting through hidden or unobserved qualities in our culture and technology. Additionally, Levinson (1999) contributes by deploying the tetrad to examine the influence of the internet on social structure, including the ability to create a more democratic society.

The current analysis is presented in the following structure. First, the cop-watching literature is briefly reviewed followed by an overview of counter-surveillance research. A more detailed description of McLuhan's theoretical framework is then explicated, highlighting the contributions this perspective offers to understanding internet-related issues. Finally, McLuhan's theory is applied to the practice of disseminating cop-watching videos. In particular, we conduct a case study to examine how McLuhan's tetrad informs our understanding of two cop-watching websites and their democratic potentialities. The results for the analysis are grounded in previous literature and from a case study of eight cop-watching organizations' websites.

Cop-watching

The activity of cop-watching has recently received a significant amount of academic attention. There is a growing movement towards recording police activities to mitigate police behavior and to foster accountability of police practices through transparency. Watching the police, then, is a form of *video-activism* where citizens attempt to expose deviant police behavior, monitor routine interactions between citizens and the police, and to challenge the largely unidirectional gaze of surveillance (Jones and Raymond 2012; Wilson and Serisier 2010). For these activists, the internet serves as a valuable tool to share information about their goals and political philosophy (Bradshaw 2013) as well as guides formonitoring the police safely and legally(ACLU 2012; Huey et al. 2006). Harding (1998: 83) suggests the rise of video activism developed from three trends: “the emergence of a vibrant form of activism, the availability of camcorders, and the failure of mainstream media to adequately cover the boom in mainstream politics.” Video-activists see themselves as able to turn-the-tables on authorities and redirect attention to inhumane police practices, ideally putting public officials on the defensive. Citizens video record the police for a variety of reasons, almost all of which are dedicated towards reducing police abuses of authority (e.g., use of force in protests or stop and frisk searches) (Wilson and Serisier 2010).

Research has found that the proliferation of counter-surveillance footage and related technologies in the last ten years has undermined the distinction between *watcher* and *watched* (Wilson and Serisier 2010). A corresponding increase in public visibility of policing has also occurred. Cop-watching has also been found to create problems for police image maintenance, potentially threatening their legitimacy (Goldsmith 2010). Additionally, while mobile media can be used as a tool for counter-surveillance, the

use of technologies for surveillance is mitigated by uncertainties about these technologies and disparities in access (Shaw 2013). These technologies also can be used to control authorities, but can be used by authorities to limit and control the protestors as well (Shaw 2013). Finally, Bradshaw (2013) shows how global justice activists use Indymedia to disseminate information about their goals and philosophy of their movement.

The studies exploring the use of alternative media in the cop-watching movements emphasize the importance of having alternative outlets to disseminate video (Bradshaw 2013; Wilson and Serisier 2010). These studies focus on the internet or Indymedia being a source for distributing the content of their political action, but do not consider how the medium itself is influencing their movement. Absent in these discussion are reflections on the limitations of the internet as a medium for disseminating videos of police abuse and achieving democratic potentialities, especially in light of the increasingly expansive nature of surveillance.

Surveillance and Counter-Surveillance

The potential of counter-surveillance to create transparency and accountability among the police is a complex process. Just as counter-surveillance came about to oppose official surveillance assemblages, these authorities also resist counter-surveillance tactics to maintain their secrecy. The evolving tactics by authorities and activists complicate the distinctions between the watcher and the watched; it eliminates the top-down, unidimensional gaze and replaces it with “rhizomatic intertwining and intersecting networks of observation” (Wilson and Serisier 2010: 167). The accessibility of cheap surveillance equipment has leveled the playing field in surveillance to some degree (Marx 2003), and made transparency in policing possible (Wilson and Serisier 2010). Koskela (2009: 151) suggests this growth of counter-surveillance has made “the old story about the ‘good police officers’ chasing ‘evil criminals’ sound like a naïve fairy tale.”

The research on watching the police is predicated on the basic idea of reversing the field of vision by observing and scrutinizing officials (typically law enforcement) for the purpose of challenging authority and institutional reform (Marx 2003; Monahan 2006). This process of reversing the gaze has been referred to as counter-surveillance (Monahan 2006)¹ and *sousveillance* (Mann 2002).² The common goal of these forms of counter-surveillance is ultimately accountability, transparency, and change when necessary. These goals are largely dependent on the counter-surveillance target, whether it is attacking and interrupting the surveillance infrastructure—such as opposition to CCTV cameras (Andrejevic 2005; Koskela 2003; McGrath 2004; Monahan 2006; Wilson and Serisier 2010; Yar 2003) or watching the police (Lyon 2007; Wilson and Serisier 2010). The purpose of each form of counter-surveillance is to resist various surveillance assemblages which have pervasively emerged as one of the key components of control in late-modernity (Haggerty and Ericson 2007).

The mass production of camera phones, webcams, camcorders, and proliferation of CCTV/security cameras has greatly expanded the capacity for surveillance (Huey et al. 2006). For instance, as of 2004 there were estimated to be 30 million surveillance cameras operating in the United States (Vlahos 2009). The increase in digital surveillance allows authorities to “easily and efficiently store, sort, classify, retrieve, and match information in digital systems [and this ability] becomes increasingly significant, amplifying the capacities of the surveyor and the effect on the surveilled far beyond the potential of analogue methods” (Martin, van Brakel, and Bernhard 2009: 215). Or in other words, digital surveillance allows more pervasive surveillance in real time.

¹Monahan (2006: 516) defines counter-surveillance as the “intentional, tactical uses, or disruptions of surveillance technologies to challenge institutional power asymmetries.”

²Mann (2002) refers to counter-surveillance as *sousveillance*, which constitutes the use of surveillance from low places, rather than high—i.e. buildings.

The widening of the surveillance assemblages cannot solely be attributed to government actions. Citizens play an important role in a late-modern surveillance, one that goes beyond viewing to participation (Huey et al. 2006; Koskela 2011; Marx 2003, 2006; Monahan 2006). The inclusion of citizens in surveillance assemblages can be attributed to two factors. First, citizens have greater access to surveillance equipment than ever before. Second, there has been a cultural shift in government surveillance to recruit citizens to participate in the crime-control apparatus and be responsible for their own security (Garland 2001; Rose 2000). As Garland (2001: 124-5) argues, “[t]he primary objective is to spread responsibility for crime control onto agencies, organizations, and individuals that operate outside the criminal justice state and to persuade them to act appropriately.” This culture seeks to normalize hyper-awareness and convince citizens to take part in crime control through reporting—or recording when possible—suspicious activity or creating their own watch organizations.

The emphasis on citizen participation in surveillance alters the relationship of surveillance from a top-down perspective to an inclusive assemblage (Koskela 2011). The expansive nature of surveillance and the inclusion of citizens blur the distinction between officials and the public, and raises questions about the appropriate targets and uses of surveillance. An expanding surveillance assemblage inevitably infringes of privacy and results in resistance strategies. Despite authorities seeking to ensure citizen acceptance of and participation in surveillance, resistance exists which seeks to limit, destroy or expose the omnipresence of such surveillance. Several researchers have noted a movement of resistance or *counter-surveillance* that seeks to foster debate about surveillance either through the creation of their own surveillance regimes (Doyle 2003, 2006; Gilliom 2006; Huey et al. 2006; Koskela 2011; Mann et al. 2003; Martin et al. 2009; Marx 2003, 2006; Monahan 2006; Smith 2011; Welch 2011; Wilson and Serisier 2010). Despite the increasingly large amount of research that examines the interplay between the watcher and the watched, few studies have explored the dissemination of the videos (Bradshaw 2013; Wilson and Serisier 2010) and, more importantly, they have not examined the complications involved in the medium of delivery.

McLuhan and the Media

As previously discussed, research tells us that cop-watching can have positive influence on police accountability and can generate critical discourses on police practices (Leistert 2012; Wilson and Serisier 2010). This literature also asserts that the interplay between the watched and the watchers is undermined by an increase in access to video technologies. The argument is also made that dissemination of videos through the internet can generate political action. Such an assertion, however, is predicated on the *content* of the video. What is largely ignored in the cop-watching research is how the internet, as a medium, influences the discourse, particularly between audience and activist/videographer. Marshall McLuhan, in *Understanding Media* (1964), suggests we are often so distracted by the medium’s message or content that we do not question the influence of the medium itself in shaping meaning. Traditionally, media studies have granted the content primacy, but McLuhan reverses this relationship. He suggests the reason that the medium has been neglected is because it is invisible. While McLuhan does not ignore the importance of meaning encoded into content (in this instance videography of police brutality), he acknowledges that the medium used to send a message influences the message itself.

McLuhan’s media theory also suggests that the characteristics of the medium influences human interactions and the social environments in which they operate by extending our capabilities. As he states: “all media, from phonetic alphabet to the computer, are extensions of man that cause deep and lasting changes in him and transform his environment” (1969: 54). McLuhan understands a medium as an extension of all human capabilities that enhances the capacity to move or do, to seek and know, and to relate to others (McLuhan 1964). These three aspects are closely intertwined and, combined with the message that comes from the medium, influence the form or thought of the media’s user (Hodge 2003). McLuhan observes that the message of any medium is “the change of scale or pace or pattern that it

introduces into human affairs” (McLuhan 1964: 8), and this is its “true” impact. This indicates that a medium, including the internet, is generated in social contexts and reflects society. McLuhan suggests, however, that we forget that a medium reflects ourselves because we become alienated from our own creations. We become numb to our innovations and fail to see the consequences of our creation. He further argues that, just as every medium creates new patterns to human interaction; it also provides amputations because our new creations begin to act as prosthetic devices that take away prior forms of interaction. In other words, as new media come with new forms of costs and benefits, they also create a particular bias that promotes certain uses over others.

McLuhan’s (1964) works predates the internet, but the theory still lends itself to an understanding of the implications of the internet as a vehicle for transmitting content. McLuhan recognizes that any new medium contains elements of previous media, therefore the internet is not an entirely new medium, rather it is a one which subsumes and augments other media within it. In this sense, the internet may shape, alter, or even amplify the characteristics of other media. Videos, songs, and print are frequently used to communicate information through the medium of the internet and such combinations help shape users’ experiences online. The uniqueness of the internet as a medium is that it “makes more information available to a greater number of people, more easily, and from a wider array of sources, than any instrument of information and communication in history” (Kahn and Kellner 2006: 704).

McLuhan later developed a conceptual tetrad to analyze the influence of different media on social interactions. In the *Laws of Media* (1992), McLuhan and his son argue that such a tetrad can expose the unobserved qualities in our culture and technology. Here, the influence of any media can be seen on four levels showing “the logos-structure of each artefact, and giving its four ‘parts’ as metaphor, or word” (1992: 128). In this process McLuhan’s tetrad becomes a grid where the four laws exist simultaneously, and the tetrad then becomes a tool for understanding the dynamic process of altering social interactions. McLuhan noted that the tetrad consisted of four questions (1992: 7):

1. What does enhance or intensify?
2. What does it render obsolete or displace?
3. What does it retrieve that had been previously obsolesced?
4. What does it produce or become when pressed to an extreme?

McLuhan uses the four questions of the tetrad as a “means of focusing awareness of hidden or unobserved qualities in our culture or technology” (1992: 128). In essence, these questions are designed to deconstruct how technology can enhance or restrict human interaction. Further, McLuhan examines how technology can retrieve prior forms of interactions and make current forms of interaction obsolete. McLuhan applied these tetrads to many forms of media including the television and the mobile phone. In the case of the latter, McLuhan notes that it enhances “interpersonal communication, accessibility, and response time”; it makes obsolete “phone booths, privacy and anonymity”; it retrieves “acoustic space, tribal culture, and cameras” and it reverse “letters” (1992: 153).

Paul Levinson (1999) examines McLuhan’s work in the context of the digital information age, arguing McLuhan is more relevant now than ever. Levinson applies the tetrad to the television and the web, providing three key insights for understanding McLuhan’s tetrad. First, the reversal is not a complete antithesis or opposite of what comes before, alluding to the idea that any reversal that occurs in a technology is not complete, but rather a setback in the use of the technology. More importantly, Levinson notes that out of the four components of the tetrad, the reversal is the one that has not taken place yet, it will occur in the future. This recognition means that if we are aware of the influences of media then we can anticipate future changes and take action. The idea that through consciousness or awareness, humans can do something about the influence of human/technological relationships shows that the effects of media are not deterministic. Levinson shows that McLuhan’s purpose was to “rouse us from our numbness at the

effects of our media” (1999: 201). Rather, the influence of media is perhaps best thought of as “systems of communication become part of the material and symbolic environment that creates certain possibilities and encourages certain forms of interactions while discouraging others” (Meyrowitz 2008: 642).

McLuhan's Tetrad, Cop-Watching, and the Internet

Using the McLuhanian tetrad as a foundation, the current analysis argues numerous points about how the internet medium shapes the discourse on cop-watching. First, the internet *enhances* the experience of information accessibility by amplifying the speed of delivery. This speed presents important dynamics for such experiences which will be explicated. Second, the internet *retrieves* the importance of the storyteller. Now anyone has the capacity to publish their work online through social networks, tweets, or blogs. Third, the internet *obsolesces* older forms of media, such as newspaper, which yields certain consequences. Finally, McLuhan warns that any new medium, when taken to its extreme, has the potential to *reverse* earlier improvements. McLuhan notes that when a medium is pushed to its limits, the medium will eventually flip on its users and create new problems that must be addressed. This analysis plays particular attention to how the internet, when taken to its extreme, can reverse what it enhances, retrieves, or obsolesces in regards to the cop-watching movement.

McLuhan's work provides a framework that encourages awareness of the influences of media, including the internet. McLuhan's use of the tetrad provides an analytical tool for understanding how media can alter preexisting social forces and trends. More recent work by medium theorists has found support for McLuhan's perspectives (Levinson 1999; Meyrowitz 2008; Strate 2008). One way to understand the relationship between the internet and cop-watching is through a case study. The websites established by cop-watching organizations provide a portal for understanding how these movements use the internet to distribute information in hopes of raising awareness and change. This study examines two cop-watch websites—CopWatch Berkeley (berkeleycopwatch.org) and Cop Block (copblock.org)—to isolate the type of content provided, how the websites are set-up, and whether they advance further political action.³ In particular, the websites are examined using the tetrad and asking how these websites, as a medium, enhance, retrieve, obsolesce, and reverse the democratic potentialities of online cop-watching movements. The following sections will discuss each of the tetrad's components in turn, while also noting how each element of the tetrad when taken to its extreme can reverse its benefits.

Enhancing the Information Experience: The Message at the Light of Speed

The emergence and fast adoption of the internet by a wide range of individuals, groups, and protest movements has given rise to a vast literature discussing the democratic potentialities of the internet. Many scholars note that cyberspace provides an open forum for individuals as it shifts power away from governments and corporations into the hands of the citizenry (Brighenti 2010; Morrison 2009; Whitson 2010). The reasons for individuals coming online vary as do the cultural perspectives these users possess. Regardless of the various personal, social, or cultural codes users bring to the online experience, when an activist posts a video of police deviance online the medium (internet) has an influence on the message. Web 2.0 provides considerable access for individuals who are looking for information on cop-watching or instances of police deviance. The cop-watching websites reviewed take advantage of the connectivity of the social networks to communicate their message. A key factor in this scenario is *speed* which, in terms of McLuhan's tetrad, serves to *enhance* the experience of information delivery and consumption.

³ The Berkeley cop watch is part of a network of websites oriented towards holding the police accountable. The Berkeley organization was the first and subsequent cop watch organizations and websites have developed in: Copwatch of East Atlanta (copwatchoea.org), Oakland Copwatch (wecopwatch.com), Portland Copwatch (portlandcopwatch.org), West Denver Copwatch (westdenvercopwatch.com), Redwood Curtain Copwatch (redwoodcurtaincopwatch.net), and Rose City copwatch (rosecitycopwatch.com).

The Berkeley Cop Watch and Cop Block websites were created as a central depository of resources for the purpose of educating individuals on their rights and disseminating material (including videos) on the problems of police abuse. These websites are both oriented towards maintaining an open dialogue in achieving changes to police tactics and behavior. For instance, Cop Block describes itself as a “decentralized project supported by a diverse group of individuals united by their shared goal of police accountability.” Berkeley Cop Watch (BCW) also notes the purpose of the organization is to reach a point “where fundamental change in the nature of policing becomes inevitable.” These organizations use their websites to enhance the information available to citizens on police violations. One component of this enhancement is the process of connecting viewers to a wider audience through social networking and links to other websites on the topic. For instance, Cop Block makes use of Twitter, Facebook, and a YouTube channel to disseminate videos and other information to maximize the speed and distance in which information travels. The access to a large amount of material within these websites provides the user with information at a heightened pace, but also has the potential to overwhelm the user due to the sheer amount of content.

Indeed, this speed of exposure is a key feature of videos shared over the internet. As such, understanding the implications of speed are vital if we are to fully comprehend how media transforms meaning and experience under the perspective provided by McLuhan (1964). The speed provides the means to access information at a rapid pace from around the world; however, we often get lost in speed. French post-modernist Paul Virilio (2005/2008) provides insights into how speed of exposure to stimuli influences experience and understanding phenomenologically—insights which can easily be transplanted into McLuhan’s media theory. He characterizes increasing speed of transmission and exposure to images as stripping the gravity from lived events. To him the experience of speed is described as “the trees that file past on the screen of the windshield, the images that rise up on the television ... all substitutes for reality, these apparent movements are only simulacra” (Virilio 2005/2008: 110). Indeed, he further describes the illusory nature of the experience of speed in terms of its anesthetizing effect. When the information experience happens at such a break-neck pace, it becomes very easy to minimize the event and distance oneself from it. The speed of the internet makes it easy to create distance from an issue even when users are interested enough in a video to view and share it with others (often over social networks).

The rapidity in which people can share, transmit, and view these videos makes it simple for users to feel as if they are politically engaged despite having limited their total exposure to the video and exerting minimal effort to share the video with others—its transmission only requires a few clicks. This process leads to what has been termed *slacktivism*, or “engaging in feel-good forms of political participation that have little or no impact on effecting change” (Vitak, Zube, Smock, Carr, Ellison, and Lampe 2011: 112). For example, users on Facebook may “share” a video with their friends or on their “wall” and others may comment on the video and even “like” the video. The users will talk about the video for a couple of hours or maybe even a couple of days. Eventually interest wanes and a new social or political issue supplants the first in a spiral that continues ad infinitum. Eventually online identities and community are turned into “normative ideals by information rhetorics and cybertechnics” resulting in a normalizing of certain behaviors (Luke 2002: 529). No substantive change is typically made but users feel a sense of political accomplishment. In short, using the internet to disseminate videos allows for quick, inexpensive, and widespread proliferation of the video but also reduces the political impact the video has on its viewers and the social issue at hand.

Accompanying the speed provided by the internet is content saturation. The same speed that makes it possible to quickly move throughout the web also limits the influence of this connectivity through saturation. Since digital real estate across this global network is relatively inexpensive and content can be uploaded, downloaded, and transferred with such rapidity, the raw volume of content made available becomes overwhelming. In this sense, the internet provides a tremendous amount of content and the ability for people to move through this information swiftly. The combination of these two elements can

easily contribute to information overload, which may hamper the political potential of video activism. For example, news websites are often streamlined so users can quickly scan headlines to find stories which interest them in the least amount of time possible. Even when users take the time to read a story or watch a video, they are quickly able to distance themselves from it by clicking on that next link. This is the internet's version of what Postman (1985) calls *Now...This*. Postman, using McLuhan's theoretical framework, suggests that *Now...This* is used in television to indicate that the previous clip is not related to the next. According to Postman (1985: 99) "the phrase is a means of acknowledging the fact that the world as mapped by the speeded-up electronic media has no order or meaning and is not to be taken seriously." In the context of the internet, *Now...This* would refer to the fact that the next online video is only ever a click away. This process lowers the importance we assign to a video because it was so easily dismissed with a click. For the activist, this means that the shock and awe of the video—meant to incite political action or discussion—is muffled or even muted altogether. The results of a continuous self-expression can be transformed "into a cacophony of voices impeding any serious discussion. The online debate on important issues are frequently polarized by messages assuming extreme positions" (Bentivegna 2002: 57).

The ability of the internet to generate political consensus is thus challenged through a lack of inclusivity and understanding. Amidst this context of rapidity and saturation, the *presentation* of internet content also presents particular limitations for video activism. Mass media often presents news devoid of context; however, the internet is often worse. Videos which seek political change can deliver content in a visually engaging manner with few educational limits of accessibility (as videos often do not require the ability to read, perform math, etc.). Videos are capable of capturing the visceral nature of police deviance for the viewer like few other media can. Internet video, however, has particular limitations which make it problematic for activism. While the viewer can see the immediate event of brutality or corruption shown through the video, they are missing what happened before or after the event, what happens outside of the frame of the video, and the personal histories of the various actors—a more intense version of what Postman (1985) describes as occurs with television. For instance, Berkeley Cop Watch provides numerous videos of police abuse but the majority of these videos provide little context to what happened before or after the video.

All of these factors impact the occurrence of the event and their inclusion can shape our interpretation. In this sense, the speed of the internet presents five potential problems for video activism, it: (1) renders content as anesthetized simulation, (2) creates perceptual distance between the viewer and the target of political discourse, (3) allows content to accumulate rapidly which engenders saturation allowing video-activism to become lost in a sea of competing messages, (4) allows users to quickly expose themselves to political messages and move on in equal rapidity, and (5) restricts the sub-media used and content presentation which encourages less context to accompany political messages. All five of these dimensions contribute to potential political neutralization and decontextualization of video-activist content.

Retrieving the Storyteller

Just as the internet has enhanced many of the democratic potentialities of cop-watching and counter-surveillance movements, the internet—in terms of McLuhan's tetrad—has also *retrieved* the importance of the storyteller. The internet has opened the boundaries for political participation and discussion through the development and refining of forums for communication like blogs, wikis, and social networks which can add much needed, but sometimes misleading, context and meaning to posted-videos (Whitson 2010). These forums allow any individual with access to the internet to produce their commentary or thoughts on political movements, news stories, or events. Berkeley Cop Watch and Cop Block both advocate for individuals to submit material, opening up the possibility for anyone to contribute videos or essays. Berkeley Cop Watch provides contact information for sending information in while Cop Block has a separate submission section for users. In addition, Cop Block provides resources for how to download an App that provides free streaming. Both of these organizations rely on volunteers to contribute to the

creation, maintenance, and content of the website placing the individual storyteller in a central position. The websites offer a depository for users to participate in the process of cop-watching and contribute to larger narratives of police accountability.

The success of these forums, however, is contingent on users submitting material, gaining an audience. The website for Berkeley Cop Watch is limited in the amount of new material posted on the website. Postings in the community blog and news sections indicate that content is submitted once a week. The Cop Block website, however, has daily posts on events around the United States including articles, podcasts, and videos. Despite providing regular updates the Cop Block website is still limited in its exposure to wider audiences. After all, the success of video-activism seeking official accountability hinges on enlisting popular support, which requires the communicating of ideas to the public at large (Huey et al. 2006). The Berkeley Cop Watch website has a limited audience due to the local focus of their efforts; however, Cop Block has a national audience and seeks out citizens and law enforcement alike. Examination of the Cop Block website does not provide an indication of its audience, but through its social networking links one can discover over 200,000 follow Cop Block on Facebook.

The Cop Block website appears to provide updated material and reach a wider audience, seemingly retrieving the storyteller and placing her/him in an important position of delivering news. Cop Block has a large following, but research indicates that many people turn to the internet for entertainment rather than politics, even when the subject matter is deemed as serious (Hess 2009). This raises the question as to what audience the storyteller is reaching. Wilson and Serisier (2010) in their study noted the struggle of activists to understand what audience they were reaching, raising the question as to whether a storyteller is heard. In this sense, the importance of the narrator is simultaneously *retrieved* and also *buried* under the weight of the internet. The internet encourages mass participation but, as described earlier, it encourages this at such a scale that an overload of content makes it easy for any single political message to become lost, like one voice trying to be heard in a stadium full of raucous people. The internet is seen as an open forum for participation, and the cop-watching websites reflect this idea. The following section discusses how the internet makes obsolete other forms of media and becomes a primary source of information.

Media Obsolescence and Indymedia at the Margins

As a medium, the internet acts to make previous forms of media obsolete. Such processes are evident in the erosion of print media and declines in traditional audio-video media formats, such as CDs and DVDs. Functions previously served by networked media, such as the delivery of news, television content, and telecommunications, have been subsumed under the internet as a result of its ubiquity, speed, and bandwidth. In the process of rendering previous forms of media increasingly obsolete, the internet is often lauded for creating spaces where Indymedia groups can thrive and can thus challenge dominant media structures and ownership. Old media formats which were previously owned/controlled largely by media oligopolies have ideally been rendered obsolete, making way for smaller, more independent media creators, including video activists.

The problem with such thinking is that it is utopian—while the internet does foster the development of Indymedia and activist networks, such spaces are also rich for colonization by major media companies as well. Only a handful of companies remain that disproportionately control the market in providing the internet to consumers (Hess 2009). These same companies also often own the majority of existing television and newspaper networks which they transition their form to fit within the internet. Such businesses are also embroiled in battles net neutrality laws that provide equal coverage to all websites. These telecommunications companies are continually pushing the boundaries of commercializing every aspect of the internet (Hess 2009). In this sense, media companies are struggling to dominate the internet to maintain a relative media oligopoly.

Additionally, while media companies seek to encroach on ever broader swathes of ethereal digital localities, Indymedia and other small media interests seek to use the internet to spread messages. Much of this content, however, is lost in the shuffle because many people turn to the internet as a replacement for older forms of media, and thus seek out familiar media interests (Jenkins 2008). This causes problems for websites promoting cop-watching because their audience becomes limited as they are not prominently featured in the mainstream media on the internet. The cop-watching websites suffer from little traffic because as Andrejevic (2007: 205) notes internet users have “the mind-set that allows individuals to feel comfortable deliberately seeking out only the select group of news sources with predictable slants.” A video posted on police deviance will just as likely reach a person interested in the comedic effects of someone getting beat up, as it will an activist concerned with police power.

In summary, the internet, as a media, is open not just for Indymedia and activists—a potential of the internet often celebrated. Indeed, while the internet has rendered many previous media formats increasingly obsolete, media companies have begun migrating to the internet, and finding increasingly sophisticated ways to control content and attract audience attention. In this way, the internet simultaneously opens avenues for independent media and suppresses its political potential.

Reversing and the Internet

The use of the internet by video activists is an important domain for political struggles pursuing social justice, even when one considers mainstream media dominance. The internet is prized for its perceived ability to reinvigorate communities and increase political discourse (Moulthrop 1994; Palczewski 2001; Regan and Stevens 2010; Rheingold 2000; Whitson 2010). The use of McLuhan's tetrad thus far has shown that the internet enhances the ability of individuals to connect with each other and reinvigorates the role of the storyteller. However, in each instance the internet also reverses the influence of the cop-watching websites. As the internet enhances the connectivity of cop-watching networks, it also saturates the content through the sheer amount of information. The sheer volume also decreases the influence of the storyteller as an individual's contribution can fall into the abyss with other information. Finally, the internet makes obsolete the need for mass media, but the internet also provides media conglomerates with extensive control over the flow of information. Each of these reversals threatens the democratic potentialities of cop-watching, but other types of reversals also exist. First, the internet is a double-edged sword; new opportunities for counter-surveillance strategies and video-activism are made available but also presented are new opportunities for surveillance by institutions of authority. Second, the discussion formats presented for participants/activists to engage in political discourse present their own limitations.

The internet is perhaps the most important surveillance apparatus of the state, as millions of people volunteer to participate through their own self-disclosure of information to websites such as Facebook, Amazon, and Google (Bollier 2003; Goldsmith and Wu 2006; Nunziato 2009). Lyon (2001: 101) notes that “all uses of the Internet, the World Wide Web and email systems are traceable and this capacity is rapidly being exploited as these media are commercialized.” Governments and private companies are actively recording an inordinate amount of information on users which consumers are not made fully aware of. Parenti (2003: 78) notes “surveillance becomes more ubiquitous, automatic, anonymous, decentralized, and self-reinforcing.” The internet creates a form of *dataveillance* where people's behaviors are systematically monitored (Clarke 1988). Marx (2002: 29) notes that in traditional surveillance the subject is more likely to know if they are under surveillance, however, in contemporary surveillance “the surveillant knows things the subject doesn't”—one need only to reflect on the National Security Agency's PRISM program to glean the significance here. As a result, the internet's ability to accelerate the communication of individuals from around the world is compensated for by the “capacity of elites to monitor user Internet activity” (Havick 2000: 283).

The development of a massive surveillance state on the internet threatens many of the democratic potentialities that the internet offered to enhance (Fuchs, Boersma, Albrechtslund, and Sandoval 2011).

The online surveillance state is also outside the concerns of many of the cop-watching organizations examined. None of the websites post information on maintaining anonymity on the web, avoiding surveillance, or offer protections for individuals who upload videos of the police. The approach of the websites as a medium where one can freely engage in dialogue with other activists creates a dangerous assumption: "it invites a false sense of secure speech and ability of empowerment, believing that the medium operates as a town hall debate" (Hess 2009: 245) To understand the internet as a medium, one must understand that the internet creates certain environments for communications and limits others.

The lack of recognition towards the internet as a surveillant instrument is indicative of the process of not understanding the internet as a particular medium that benefits certain forms of communication and threatens others. The lack of awareness towards the medium's influence makes these websites tools for law enforcement. For instance, the Denver Police Department used YouTube and other online sources to track down Occupy protestors suspected of assault (Whipple 2011). Further, in mass protest situations, activists set up websites to communicate, but these websites also allow authorities to track the actions, locations, and identities of users. Discussions on rallies or mass protests were rare on the analyzed websites; however, the few instances of discussions involved considerable detail on the location of protests and who would be attending, providing authorities with key information for limiting the effectiveness of the collective action. Andrejevic (2007: 257) suggests that the internet is digital enclosures that "foster asymmetrical and undemocratic power relations." This suggests that the internet creates new avenues and techniques for activists to communicate and build organizations, however, authorities co-evolve with activists in order to create new methods of control and to expand surveillance. The lack of awareness or material produced to visitors discussing these potentialities raises ethical concerns over protecting the identities of individuals involved in the video. The privacy rights of the persons captured in the video are not considered in favor of disseminating the video to a larger audience whether for democracy or spectacle. The focus on capturing police deviance and reporting it has the collateral consequence of bringing bystanders into the discussion.

Additionally, the use of various video comment formats, discussion boards, and social media for online political discussion are poor communicative environments for political discourse. This is seen as the two websites offer little space for commentary by viewers, preferring to allow these spaces on social networking sites. For instance, Cop Block's Facebook account is littered with videos that viewers respond to in support of or opposition to the actions, often with unabashed opinions on the nature of the video. These commentaries are often a back and forth between opposing viewpoints that quickly move off topic. Furthermore, the permanency of commentary online ensures that a position upheld by an individual is forever maintained online. In these places, everyone is allowed a voice, but political dynamism is often lost under cacophony.

Conclusion

Prior research on cop-watching has focused on the ethics, techniques, and purpose of cop-watching as part of a counter-surveillance movement aimed at democratic change (Brighenti 2010; Johnson and Wayland 2010; Koskela 2011; Mann, Nolan, and Wellman 2003; Monahan 2010; Regan and Stevens 2010; Ullrich and Wollinger 2011; Whitson 2010; Wilson and Serisier 2010). These studies acknowledged the use of media as a way to reach a wider audience including the use of Indymedia and the internet, but these studies did not address how these media alter our social relationships. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of the internet on shaping the democratic potentialities of cop-watching organizations. In particular, the study used McLuhan's (1992) tetrad to examine how the internet enhances, retrieves, obsolesces, and reverses the dissemination of cop-watching discourse.

The application of McLuhan's tetrad to the influence of the internet on cop-watching organizations reveals that the accessibility of the internet enhances the ability of these organizations to connect to a wider

audience with greater speed and breadth than ever before. But the connectivity allows users to rapidly move across the web with the user becoming saturated with information. Further, the development of these websites retrieves the storyteller by providing an open forum for individuals to provide contributions to the wider issue of police deviance and modes of governance; however, these same storytellers are often buried by the overload of content available online. The internet was also argued to simultaneously offer a platform for information production and distribution outside the confines of corporate media while also serving as a rich space for corporate colonization. Finally, the internet yields reversals outside those ascribed to other components of McLuhan's tetrad. One such reversal involves cop-watching—a movement dedicated towards counter-surveillance of the police—participates in a media which itself is increasingly subjected to surveillance, particularly salient following revelations of mass-surveillance conducted by the National Security Agency, the other. The other reversal discussed is that online public communications platforms are often formatted in ways which seem to limit the impact of political discourse. The four laws of media show the process that a technology or medium goes through over its life span, “it extends or expands some function or pattern, makes obsolete some other pattern, retrieves some older practices or functions in a new form, but eventually goes too far and bring about a reversal of the function it was meant to perform” (Bobbitt 2012: 12). It should be emphasized that this is a simultaneous process and its order and outcomes are not deterministic, it is a dialectical process, an evolution.

The result is that the internet produces democratic pitfalls and the potential to close off access to democratic movements through censorship or information overload (Monahan 2010). The internet can enhance democratic functions but it can also flip into a complete surveillance society. Neither of these forms are static, rather they are in conflict and forms shape. As the internet forms a surveillance function, cop-watching can retrieve more traditional means of organizing and protesting. Leistert (2012) shows this circular process noting that as activists attempt to mitigate surveillance, the surveilling parties adapt. Further, the internet can perpetuate existing social inequalities and create further inequalities. This study reveals that the battle to achieve democratic change through cop-watching and the dissemination of information via the internet is ongoing.

Despite the findings indicating the internet may be limited in its ability to evoke change, this study is not without limitations. First, the case study using the content of cop-watching as an indicator of concerns of the movement is limited. The study does not examine whether these movements are effective, their successes, or why individuals video the police. Rather, this examination is focused on how the internet, as a medium, shapes our understanding of cop-watching through the production and dissemination of what is presented on the websites. A better approach would be to conduct interviews with these organizations to ask specific questions about how they use the internet and their concerns regarding the internet. Second, this study focused on one component of the cop-watching movement. Future research should examine the motivations of activists, their techniques, the ethical implications of cop-watching,⁴ and how they use the internet to seek out reform. Finally, this study cannot provide evidence of how these websites have enacted social and political change. The only way these website indicate success is whether or not a story was posted that linked activists to a policy change or positive outcome and these were not found.

Within the boundaries of the limitations this study offers a theoretical framework that can explain how different types of mediums can influence the type of social interaction people and the potential for democratic social movements to use the internet to further their cause. As Monahan (2010: 93) notes, “an important analytical step toward democratizing technology is recognizing the political nature and social agency of all technologies.” The literature on counter-surveillance techniques, particularly those that deal with cop-watching—must pay attention to the internet as a medium. McLuhan observes that the message

⁴ The ethical implications of cop-watching were not discussed in this study, but it is noted that both the Berkeley Cop Watch and Cop Block websites do not advocate for interfering with the police while recording their behavior. Furthermore, both websites note that their purpose is not to “hate” the police but to ensure they are not granted extra rights.

of any medium is the “change of scale or pace or pattern that it introduces into human affairs” (McLuhan 1964: 8). The relationships between the video-activists, the internet, and the viewer are complex and recursive and the posted video by activists does not cause a unified interpretation. While, the research on cop-watching shows that counter-surveillance movements make use of several tactics to overcome state censorship (Wilson and Serisier 2010), our analysis reveals that the discourse on cop-watching websites regarding online surveillance is absent. McLuhan’s theoretical framework is still a relevant tool for opening new lines of inquiry and understanding the link between on-the-ground activism and dissemination across time and space. McLuhan’s theory can be applied to the intricacies of the internet and can tackle the multiplicity of uses the internet offers.

References

- American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). 2012. *Know Your Rights: Photographers*. Retrieved from <http://www.aclu.org/free-speech/know-your-rights-photographers>
- Andrejevic, M. 2005. The work of watching one another: Lateral surveillance, risk and governance. *Surveillance & Society* 2(4): 479-497.
- Andrejevic, M. 2007. *iSpy: Surveillance and power in the interactive era*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Bentivegna, S. 2002. Politics and the new media. In: *The Handbook of New Media*, eds L.A. Leivrouw and S. Livingstone, 50-59. London: Sage.
- Bobbitt, D. 2012. Scale in the media theory of Marshall McLuhan: An application to electronic money and the Internet. *Media Fields Journal* 4: 1-14.
- Bollier, D. 2003. *Silent Theft: The Private Plunder of our Common Wealth*. New York: Routledge.
- Bowie, D. 1973. Life on Mars? *Life on Mars* [7" single] London: RCA Records.
- Bradshaw, E. A. 2013. Online First. This is What a Police State Looks Like: Sousveillance, Direct Action and the Anti-Corporate Globalization Movement. *Critical criminology*. Online first, DOI: 10.1007/s10612-013-9205-4.
- Brighenti, A.M. 2010. Democracy and its visibilities. In: *Surveillance and democracy*, eds K.D. Haggerty and M. Samatas, 51-68. New York: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Clarke, R. 1988. Information Technology and Dataveillance. *Communication of the ACM* 31(5): 498-512.
- Doyle, A. 2003. *Arresting Images: Crime and Policing in Front of the Television Camera*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Doyle, A. 2006. An Alternative Current in Surveillance and Control: Broadcasting Surveillance Footage of Crimes. In: *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*, eds K.D. Haggerty and R.V. Ericson, 199-224. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Fuchs, C., K. Boersma, A. Albrechtslund, and M. Sandoval, eds. 2011. *Internet and Surveillance: The Challenges of Web 2.0 and Social Media*. New York: Routledge.
- Garland, D. 2001. *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gilliom, J. 2006. Struggling with Surveillance: Resistance, Consciousness, and Identity. In *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*, eds K.D. Haggerty and R.V. Ericson, 111-129. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Goldsmith, A. 2010. Policing’s new visibility. *British Journal of Criminology* 50(5): 914-934.
- Goldsmith, J. and T. Wu. 2006. *Who Controls the Internet? Illusions of a Borderless World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haggerty, K.D. and R.V. Ericson. 2007. The Surveillant Assemblage. In: *The Surveillance Studies Reader*, eds S.P. Hier and J. Greenberg, 104-116. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Harding, T. 1998. *The Video Activist Handbook* (2nd ed). London: Pluto Press.
- Havick, J. 2000. The Impact of the Internet on a Television-Based Society. *Technology in Society* 22: 273-287.
- Hess, A. 2009 Resistance Up in Smoke: Analyzing the limitations of deliberation on YouTube. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 26(5): 411-434.
- Hodge, B. 2003. How the Medium is the Message in the Unconscious of “America Online”. *Visual Communication* 2(3): 341-353.
- Huey, L., K. Walby and A. Doyle. 2006. Cop Watching in the Downtown Eastside: Exploring the use of (counter) surveillance as a tool of resistance. In: *Surveillance and Society: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, ed. T. Monahan, 149-165. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, D.G. and K.A. Wayland. 2010. Surveillance and transparency as sociotechnical systems of accountability. In: *Surveillance and democracy*, eds K.D. Haggerty and M. Samatas, 19-33. New York: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Kahn, R. and D.M. Kellner. 2006. Oppositional Politics and the Internet: A Critical/Reconstructive Approach. In: *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, eds M.G. Durham and D.M. Kellner, 703-725. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Koskela, H. 2003. Cam Era—The Contemporary Urban Panopticon. *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 292-313.
- Koskela, H. 2009. Did You Spot an Alien?: Voluntary Vigilance, Borderwork, and the Texas Border Watch Program. *Space and Polity* 14(2): 103-121.
- Koskela, H. 2011. Hijackers and Humble Servants: Individuals as Camwitnesses in Contemporary Controlwork. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(3): 269-282.
- Jenkins, H. 2008. *Convergence Culture*. New York: New York University Press.

- Jones, N., and G. Raymond. 2012. The Camera Rolls: Using Third-Party Video in Field Research. *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 642: 109-123.
- Leistert, O. 2012. Resistance against Cyber-Surveillance within Social Movements and how Surveillance adapts. *Surveillance & Society* 9(4): 441-456.
- Levinson, P. 1999. *Digital McLuhan: A Guide to the Information Millennium*. New York: Routledge.
- Luke, T.W. 2002. Power and political culture. In: *The Handbook of New Media*, eds L.A. Leivrouw and S. Livingstone, 518-532. London: Sage.
- Lyon, D. 2001. *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Lyon, D. 2007. *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Mann, S. 2002. *Intelligent Image Processing*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mann, S., J. Nolan and B. Wellman. 2003. Sousveillance: Inventing and Using Wearable Devices for Data Collection in Surveillance Environments. *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 331-355.
- Martin, A. K., R. E. van Brakel and D. J. Bernhard. 2009. Understanding Resistance to Digital Surveillance: Towards a Multi-Disciplinary, Multi-Actor Framework. *Surveillance & Society* 6(3): 213-232.
- Marx, G. 2002. What's New About the "New Surveillance"? Classifying for Change and Continuity. *Surveillance & Society* 1(1): 9-29.
- Marx, G. 2003. A Tack in the Shoe: Neutralizing and Resisting the New Surveillance. *Journal of Social Issue* 59(2): 369-390.
- Marx, G. 2006. Soft Surveillance: The Growth of Mandatory Volunteerism in Collecting Personal Information—Hey Buddy Can You Spare a DNA?. In: *Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, ed. T. Monahan, 37-56. New York: Routledge.
- McLuhan, M. 1964. *Understanding Media*. New York: New American Library.
- McLuhan, M. and E. McLuhan. 1992. *Laws of Media: The New Science*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- McGrath, J. 2004. *Loving Big Brother: Performance, Privacy, and Surveillance Space*. London: Routledge.
- Meyrowitz, J. 2008. Power, pleasure, patterns: Intersecting narratives of media influence. *Journal of Communication* 58: 641-663.
- Monahan, T. 2006. Counter-Surveillance as Political Intervention? *Social Semiotics* 16(4): 515-534.
- Monahan, T. 2010. Surveillance as governance: social inequality and the pursuit of democratic surveillance. In: *Surveillance and democracy*, eds K.D. Haggerty and M. Samatas, 91-110. New York: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Morrison, A.H. 2009. An Impossible Future: John Perry Barlow's 'Declaration of Independence of Cyberspace.' *New Media Society* 11(1/2): 53-72.
- Moulthrop, S. 1994. Rhizome and Resistance: Hypertext and the Dreams of a New Culture. In: *Hyper/Text/Theory*, ed. G.P. Landow, 299-319. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Nunziato, D. C. 2009 *Virtual Freedom: New Neutrality and Free Speech in the Internet Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Palczewski, C. H. 2001. Cyber-Movements, New Social Movements, and Counterpublics. In: *Counterpublics and the State*, eds R. Asen and D.C. Brouwer, 161-168. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Parenti, C. 2003. *The Soft Cage*. New York: Basic Books.
- Postman, N. 1985. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Penguin Group, Inc.
- Regan, P. and V. Stevens. 2010. Kids R Us: Online Social Networking and the Potential for Empowerment. *Surveillance & Society* 8(2): 151-165.
- Rheingold, H. 2000. *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rose, N. 2000. Government and Control. *British Journal of Criminology* 40(2): 321-339.
- Shaw, F. 2013. Walls of Seeing: Protest Surveillance, Embodied Boundaries, and Counter-Surveillance at Occupy Sydney. *Transformations* 23: 1-9.
- Smith, G. 2011. *Opening the Black Box: The Everyday Life of Surveillance*. London: Routledge.
- Strate, L. 2008. Studying the media as media: McLuhan and the media ecology approach. *Media Tropes* 1: 127-142.
- Ullrich, P. and G.R. Wollinger. 2011. A surveillance studies perspective on protest policing: The case of video surveillance of demonstrations in Germany. *Interface* 3(1): 12-38.
- Welch, M. 2011. Counterveillance: How Foucault and the Grouped'Information sur les Prisons reversed the optics. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(3): 301-313.
- Whipple, K. 2011. Occupy Denver: Police Track Down Protesters' identities using YouTube. *Denver Westword*. Available at http://blogs.westword.com/latestword/2011/11/occupy_denver_youtube_videos.php (last accessed 01/23/2014).
- Whitson, J.R. 2010. Surveillance and democracy in the digital enclosure. In: *Surveillance and democracy*, eds K.D. Haggerty and M. Samatas, 230-246. New York: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Wilson, D. and T. Serisier. 2010. Video Activism and the Ambiguities of Counter-Surveillance. *Surveillance & Society* 8(2): 166-180.
- Virilio, P. 2005/2008. *Negative Horizon*. New York: Continuum.
- Vitak, J., P. Zube, A. Smock, C. Carr, N. Ellison and Cl. Lampe. 2011. It's Complicated: Facebook Users' Political Participation in the 2008 Election. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 14(3): 107-114.
- Vlahos, J. 2009. Surveillance Society: New High-Tech Cameras are Watching You. *Popular Mechanic*. Available at <http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military/4236865> (last accessed 02/27/2014).
- Yar, M. 2003. Panoptic Power and the Pathologisation of Vision: Critical Reflections on the Foucauldian Thesis. *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 254-271.